

PIC  
M1151040  
correspondence

**From:** Beth Ericksen  
**To:** Daron Haddock  
**Date:** 9/19/2007 4:22 PM  
**Subject:** Re: Comment about blasting, Rockland

Thanks for your comment. I would like to elaborate a little to explain where I was coming from rule-wise:

I thought the comment was specific to his operation, since not every operator performs selective blasting of highwalls at reclamation. By rule, I felt like the comment was related to public safety and welfare under reclamation practices, where an operator should 'minimize hazards'. Since blasting is hazardous, I thought we could ask for the information about their blasting plan. If they have a blasting plan and implement it, then hazard is minimized, if they didn't then there is greater safety risk.

Thanks.

>>> Daron Haddock 9/19/2007 3:53 PM >>>

Thanks, I was just wanting to be sure we weren't requiring information that was not required by regulation. Even though it may be great information to have, we would be in a precarious position if we are requiring one operator to submit information that has not been required of all operators by rule. Your suggestion to have the Operator "consider" a blasting plan takes care of this issue.

>>> Beth Ericksen 9/19/2007 9:48 AM >>>

In response to the question regarding the selective blasting plan request, I reviewed the plan, and since at reclamation they will be blasting the crest area of the highwall, I thought in an effort to be helpful (since he is actually a small mine operator) I provided detail on what a selective blasting plan encompasses, again, since he may not know. I want to leave that response in place, however, I will change the verbiage to read:

**Consider**a selective blasting plan instead of **provide**a selective blasting plan.

I will make that change now.

-Beth

**From:** Daron Haddock  
**To:** Beth Ericksen; Paul Baker; Susan White  
**Date:** 9/19/2007 3:53 PM  
**Subject:** Re: Comment about blasting, Rockland

Thanks, I was just wanting to be sure we weren't requiring information that was not required by regulation. Even though it may be great information to have, we would be in a precarious position if we are requiring one operator to submit information that has not been required of all operators by rule. Your suggestion to have the Operator "consider" a blasting plan takes care of this issue.

>>> Beth Ericksen 9/19/2007 9:48 AM >>>

In response to the question regarding the selective blasting plan request, I reviewed the plan, and since at reclamation they will be blasting the crest area of the highwall, I thought in an effort to be helpful (since he is actually a small mine operator) I provided detail on what a selective blasting plan encompasses, again, since he may not know. I want to leave that response in place, however, I will change the verbiage to read: **Consider**a selective blasting plan instead of **provide**a selective blasting plan.

I will make that change now.

-Beth